REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 11-18 are pending in this case.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Rick, et al., (US Pub. No. 2005/0078774, herein "Rick")[1]; and Claims 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Rick in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (herein "AAPA").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the pending claims.

Claim 1 is directed to a frequency adjustment method and includes:

> receiving a signal having a first signal and a second signal, the first signal having a short cycle time and the second signal having a long cycle time longer than the short cycle time;
> detecting a deviation of a frequency of the first signal contained in the received signal and the received signal delayed by a first delay time corresponding to the short cycle time;
> detecting a deviation of a frequency of the second signal contained in the received signal and the received signal delayed by a second delay time corresponding to the long cycle time;
> **determining a deviation of a frequency of the received signal on the basis of the detected deviation of the first signal and that of the second signal; and**
> **adjusting the frequency of the received signal on the basis of the determined frequency deviation.**

The outstanding Office Action asserts Rick as teaching every element of Claim 1.

Rick describes averaging frequency error estimates over different integration lengths to generate short-term averages, or averages of frequency error over shorter integration lengths, and long-term averages, or averages of frequency error over longer integration

_____

[1] In light of the cancellation of Claims 9 and 10, the rejection is understood by Applicant to refer to Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 12, and 14-18.

lengths. In Rick, as described at paragraph [0012], when the short-term average value

exceeds a threshold value, the oscillator frequency is adjusted as a function of the short-term

average value, and when the long-term average value exceeds a threshold value, the oscillator

frequency is adjusted as a function of the long-term average value.

However, Rick does not teach or suggest at least 'determining a deviation of a

frequency of the received signal **on the basis of the detected deviation of the first signal**

and that of the second signal; and **adjusting the frequency of the received signal on the**

basis of the determined frequency deviation," as recited by Claim 1. As discussed above,

oscillator frequency of Rick is adjusted as a function of either the short-term average value **or**

the long-term average value but not "on the basis of the determined frequency deviation"

which is determined "on the basis of the detected deviation of the first signal and that of the

second signal," as recited by Claim 1. As described at paragraph [0012] of Rick, the long-

term average value is determined with a superset of frequency error estimate values that make

up the short-term average value. However, as depicted at Fig. 3 of Rick, memory is updated

and the long-term average value is reset if oscillator frequency is adjusted as a function of the

short-term average value. Thus, a long-term average value that triggers adjustment of

oscillator frequency does not also include frequency error values of a short-term average

value that triggered adjustment of oscillator frequency.

Because Rick does not teach or suggest at least the above-discussed features of Claim

1, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claim 1 and

Claims 2-6, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 14, though differing in scope and statutory class from Claim 1,

patentably define over Rick for substantially the same reasons as Claim 1. Thus, Applicant

respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claim 8, Claims 11 and

12, which depend therefrom, Claim 14, and Claims 15-18, which depend therefrom, be

withdrawn.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and Claim 13 depends from Claim 8. Therefore,

Claims 7 and 13 patentably define over <u>Rick</u> for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 8.

Further, AAPA, asserted at page 3 of the outstanding Office Action as teaching "applying the

frequency adjusting technique to OFDM," does not cure the deficiencies of <u>Rick</u> discussed

above. Thus, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 7 and 13 under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are

believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect

is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Usha Munukutla-Parker
Registration No. 61,939

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
I:\ATTY\UMP\25's\250324US\250324US AMND2.DOC